

REMARKS

Claims 72, 77, 80-85, 87, 89, 91 and 98 are pending in the application.

The examiner rejected all pending application claims as being unpatentable under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-13; 31-32; 1-9; 1-9 and 1-2 of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,472,217; 6,827,901; 5,654,199, 5,654,200 and 5,650,327 respectively. In addition, the examiner has rejected all pending application claims provisionally on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 10-18 of co-pending application number 10/236,389.

It appears that the examiner has misidentified one of the U.S. Patents in the double patenting rejection. U.S. Patent No. 5,654,901 is not owned by the common applicant of this invention nor is it a patent that relates to a similar technology. During a conversation with the Examiner on March 6, 2006, I learned that the examiner meant to refer to U.S. Patent No. 5,654,200. The applicants have prepared and filed a Terminal Disclaimer with the respect to U.S. Patent No. 5,654,200.

The applicants submitted Terminal Disclaimers with respect to each of the above-identified patents or patent application in order to overcome the examiner's obviousness-type double patenting and provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejections. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of all pending application claims is, therefore courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

McDONNELL BOEHNEN HULBERT &
BERGHOFF LLP

Dated: March 6, 2006

By:

A. Blair Hughes
Reg. No. 32,901